*Important articles from*

**BOLŞEVİK PARTİZAN**

Nr.: 1 • January 1992 • £ 0.50; FF 4.--; 1,- DM

# "On the Unity of the World Marxist-Leninist Movement"

## –Dokument from July 1981 on the Conference of the RCP USA and RCP Chiles–

# On the Unity of the World M-L Movement*

While appraising the situation in the World Communist (Marxist-Leninist) Movement in September 1979, the First Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkey/Marxist-Leninist (TKP/ML) made the following observation:

> "ON THE INTERNATIONAL PLANE, WE ARE PASSING THROUGH A PHASE IN WHICH VARIED SORTS OF THE BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY --ESPECIALLY MODERN REVISIONISM OF EVERY TINGE-- ARE ATTACKING MARXISM-LENINISM, CAUSING GRAVE DEVASTATION AND BLOWING UP THE WINDS OF CONFUSION." (from the Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Central Committee, p.1)

In continuation, the Central Committee said:

> "On taking a quick look at the development of this ideological-political confusion in the International Marxist-Leninist Movement, we see the following:

---

*(*) The present article is taken from the 2nd issue of Bolshevik Partisan. In the journal's Introductory Section, the Editorial Board made the following remarks concerning the contents of this issue (extract):*

> *"Dear reader;*
>
> *We have devoted the greater part of this issue to the question of the unity of the World Marxist-Leninist Movement. In an environment in which there exist various views and efforts for unity in the International Marxist-Leninist Movement, we considered it our bounden duty to inform our readers of the developments on this score and to propagate the Marxist-Leninist standpoint on this subject.*
>
> *More to the point, we are publishing an article elucidating the standpoint of the Editorial Board of Bolshevik Partisan on the unity of the World Marxist-Leninist Movement.*

*(Footnote continued on the next page)*

"After the October Revolution of 1917, in the course of the struggle against the opportunism of the II. International, the Comintern, the Third International, was founded under the leadership of Lenin. The Comintern was a central organization, of which the communist parties of the entire world were members. All burning questions of the International Marxist-Leninist Movement were solved in this organization by conducting open ideological struggle and discussion. The line of the World Marxist-Leninist Movement took shape during the discussions and struggles waged, and was decided jointly. Sections of the Comintern applied this jointly worked-out general line to the concrete practice of their individual countries, and this application was controlled by the Executive Committee of the Communist International (ECCI). This was a phase during which the ideological-political unity of the World Communist Movement was at its strongest, which, in the organizational field, was reflected in a centralized structure.

"During the Second World War, the Comintern was indeed dissolved, but relations between the Communist Parties of the International Marxist-Leninist Movement continued. In 1947 some Communist Parties --at the head of them the Communist Party of the Soviet Union(Bolshevik)-- formed the Communist Information Bureau (Cominform). The Cominform played an important role in the struggle against the Tito-Kardelj revisionism developing in Yugoslavia at the time. After the death of Stalin, the Cominform too was dissolved, and with it dissolved the organizational unity of the World Communist Movement trying to be reconstructed before it had a chance to develop.

"At the XX. Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the Khrushchev modern revisionists launched a large-scale ideological and political attack on Marxism-Leninism. They spread sophistries such as: many fundamental theses of Marxism-Leninism were "outmoded" and "did not correspond to the new circumstances", etc. They revised Marxism-Leninism on its fundamental points. Later, the Khrushchev revisionists ventured to impose the revisionist platform of the XX. Party Congress as the general line of the International Communist Movement.

---

*(Continued from the previous page)*

*In addition, we are publishing the following as documents:*
*- Communiqué of a Conference held in Autumn 1980 by 13 Parties and groups;*
*- A summary by us of a detailed article (Basic principles for the unity of Marxist-Leninists and for the line of the International Communist Movement --Tr.) submitted by the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA and the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile to this Conference;*
*- A criticism of the Communiqué of the 13 Parties and groups by the Communist Party of India/Marxist-Leninist (Reorganization Committee), one of the signatories;*
*- The differences between the Draft Proposal submitted by the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA and the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile and the Joint Communiqué; and*
*- A criticism of the Draft Proposal submitted by the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA and the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile for the Conference by the Marxist-Leninist Party of Austria (MLPÖ), Against the Tide (GDS) and the West Berlin Communist (WBK)." (Note by the translator.)*

"To reach this goal, they organized Meetings with representatives of the Communist Parties of the Socialist countries in 1957, and all the Communist and Workers Parties of the world in 1960. At these Meetings there took place important struggles between the Khrushchevite modern revisionists and the Marxist-Leninists who opposed the revisionist line of the XX. Party Congress. However, Marxist-Leninists made concessions of great importance, allegedly for the sake of "preserving unity". Precisely under these conditions did the Declarations of 1957 and 1960 come to pass. These declarations turned into documents which both the modern revisionists and the Marxist-Leninists defined as common documents of the World Communist Movement. Apparently, "unity" was saved. But in reality no unity existed at all.

"Since the modern revisionist leaders of the CPSU took it as their aim to create a thornless rose garden in the international plane, they launched an attack to isolate the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labor of Albania from the World Marxist-Leninist Movement after the 1960 Meeting. In face of this attack, the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labor of Albania entered into the struggle that is known as "the Great Polemic" in the international sphere. In the course of this struggle the Nine Letters of the CP of China sent to the Central Committee of the CP of the Soviet Union throughout 1963 and 1964, together with the article of the CP of China entitled "A proposal concerning the general line of the World Communist Movement" published in 1963(&) became documents which were accepted as undisputably correct and taken as the basis by the World Marxist-Leninist Movement. The World Marxist-Leninist Movement was reshaped in ideological and political respects on the basis of these documents. On the basis of these documents, many a communist party split. Marxist-Leninist forces formed new Communist Parties on this basis. In the organizational sphere these parties regrouped around the CP of China and the Party of Labor of Albania.

"In the Seventies, when mention was made of the "World Marxist-Leninist Movement", this was automatically understood as the parties and groups that clustered around the CP of China and the Party of Labor of Albania, waged struggle against Khrushchev modern revisionism and took "A proposal concerning the general line of the International Communist Movement" and the other "Polemic" articles as their basis in this struggle. From the outside, this unity seemed very solid and indestructible.

"In the course of later practice, however, it turned out that this was not so. At first, a new modern revisionist trend began to take shape in the ranks of the Marxist-Leninist movement comprising the forces combating Khrushchev modern revisionism. This new modern revisionist trend basing itself on the theses of the so-called Three Worlds Theory was in essence a reprint of the Khrushchev modern revisionism. This trend gained wide currency in the World Marxist-Leninist Movement in a short while and became dominant. Against the Three Worlds Theory, formulated in its definitive version by Teng Hsiao-ping in 1974,

---

(&) The correct description is: "A proposal concerning the general line of the International Communist Movement" sent by the Central Committee of the CP of China to the Central Committee of the CP of the Soviet Union in June 1963, and the nine Comments published between September 1963 and July 1964. (Note by the "Bolshevik Partisan„)

"an opposition started in the ranks of the World Marxist-Leninist Movement. The initial covert criticisms of this theory took an open form at the Seventh Party Congress of the Party of Labor of Albania in October 1976. This Congress became the opening salvo of the open struggle against the "Three Worlds Theory". A new alignment began to take place in the World Marxist-Leninist Movement on the basis of the defence of or opposition to the "Three Worlds Theory". The parties opposing this "theory" gathered around the Party of Labor of Albania while the parties upholding it remained around the CP of China.

"The First Conference of our Party in February 1978 took the decision to "radically reject" the modern revisionist "Theory of the Three Worlds". In this sense, from that time onwards we understood the World Marxist-Leninist Movement as meaning only those parties and groups rejecting the "Three Worlds Theory". However, one could also see with bare eyes that there were differences of opinion on varied topics within this movement.

"We were of the opinion that, in rejecting the "Three Worlds Theory", a series of parties including the Party of Labor of Albania did not reject this theory radically, but contented themselves with rejecting its conspicuously "extreme" theses. For instance, these parties continued upholding one of the basic theses of this "theory", namely, the thesis that "the two superpowers are the main enemy of the peoples of the world", as well as concepts like "developing countries", etc.

"A minority section of the parties rejecting the "Three Worlds Theory" that included us as well criticized this attitude, and demanded the radical rejection of the "Three Worlds Theory" in all its aspects and with all its theses, the deepening of the struggle against the "Three Worlds Theory", and going into the roots of modern revisionism. Further, these minority parties rejected the policy of "the arm breaking inside the sleeve" (i.e., the policy of closed-doorism --Translator's note) and demanded an open ideological struggle inside the World Marxist-Leninist Movement.

"The Party of Labor of Albania and the other parties around it opposed the "reckless" discussion of the contradictions inside the World Marxist-Leninist Movement, upheld the settlement of the problems through bilateral negotiations between the parties as a Marxist-Leninist principle and to this end produced the norms laid down in the Declarations of 1957 and 1960 as witness.

"To sum up: Although the World Marxist-Leninist Movement being reshaped on the basis of opposing the Three Worlds Theory looked like a solid unity from the outside, it contained many contradictions. Since open discussion of these contradictions was refused, it was a hollow unity that was doomed to collapse.

"In fact, that was exactly what happened. To the existing contradictions, a very important new contradiction was added from October 1978 onwards. At the "Scientific Conference" held in October '78, the Party of Labor of Albania and some parties around it gave the official stamp of approval to the theses they were trying to spread in the international plane from the beginning of 1978 onwards, the theses that "Mao Zedong had never been a Marxist-Leninist", that "the Communist Party of China under Mao's leadership had never been a Communist Party". Together with the wholesale rejection of Mao Zedong, they began to qualify the Marxist-Leninist theory on a series of points as a revisionist theory.

"In this situation, a new realignment began to take place inside the World Marxist-Leninist Movement which had previously united on the basis of opposing the "Three Worlds Theory". A group of parties including us objected to the wholesale rejection of Mao Zedong, and took a stand against the Party of Labor of Albania and some parties around it on this subject. A new differentiation began on the basis of upholding or not upholding Mao. Today this process of new differentiation is at an initial stage yet. However much this new differentiation seems like a differentiation on the basis of upholding or not upholding Mao Zedong, this broad differentiation also carries the seeds of sub-differentiation. For instance, while a section of those opposing the rejection of Mao hold the view that Mao Zedong was faultless, another section hold the view that Mao made important mistakes, that these must be investigated. While one section hold that the Declarations of 1957 and 1960 can be the platform of the International Marxist-Leninist Movement, another section hold that these documents bear very grave mistakes and cannot be its platform. Etc.

"The present confusion has arisen roughly in this way. The Party of Labor of Albania and some parties around it (these are newly-founded parties totalling 16) assert that the World Marxist-Leninist Movement at present is stronger than it has ever been. This assertion of theirs is diametrically opposite to the objective realities; it is an assertion aimed at self-deception, at giving a shot of morale. THE SO-CALLED WORLD MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT AT PRESENT IS INTERNALLY DIVIDED AND IN A STATE OF IDEOLOGICAL, POLITICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONFUSION. IT IS EXPERIENCING ONE OF ITS WEAKEST PERIODS. THERE IS ONLY A SINGLE WAY OF EMERGING OUT OF THIS PERIOD: OPEN IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE ON THE BASIC PROBLEMS OF THE WORLD MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT AND THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF IDEOLOGICAL UNITY THROUGH THIS METHOD. IN THE COURSE OF THIS STRUGGLE, THE EXPERIENCES OF THE STRUGGLE OF THE WORLD MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT AGAINST REVISIONISM AND MODERN REVISIONISM MUST BE EVALUATED; THE MISTAKES IDENTIFIED AND PURGED; AND THE MARXIST-LENINIST PLATFORM ON WHICH THE WORLD MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT WILL REUNITE MUST BE ELABORATED. THE ONLY WAY OF BRINGING ABOUT THE UNITY OF THE WORLD MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT LIES IN ACTIVE, OPEN IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE." (Ibidem, pp. 1-2)

These observations depicted the "confusion" that the so-called World Marxist-Leninist Movement found itself in, the causes of this confusion, and pointed the correct way out(1)(☆). Two years after they were made, these observations still maintain their validity today.

---

(☆) *Footnotes have been appended at the end of this article.--Translator's note*

## TODAY TOO THERE EXIST "CONFUSION" IN ALL SPHERES --IDEOLOGICAL, POLITICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL-- INSIDE THE WORLD MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT

The open differentiation that started after November 1978 in respect of the attitude toward Mao Zedung among the forces rejecting the "Three Worlds Theory" in various degrees has considerably deepened at the present stage.

The Party of Labor of Albania and the parties remaining around it have considerably systematized their views on Mao Zedong, whom they qualified as the "Khrushchev of China" and a "peasant revolutionary", a "petty-bourgeois revolutionary". (In our country the Halkin Kurtulusu ("People's Liberation") won the championship" in being most pro-PLA, and outdistanced its competitors, the Devrimci Halkin Birligi ("Revolutionary People's Unity"), the Devrimci Halkin Yolu ("Revolutionary People's Way") and the Devrimci Proletarya ("Revolutionary Proletariat")).

Those who, while opposing the criticisms brought by the Party of Labor of Albania against Mao, clutch at Mao's mistakes, who place him on a par with Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, who consider him among the classics of Marxism-Leninism, are trying to create a unity among themselves. The Conference held in Autumn 1980 under the leadership of the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA and the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile was an important step in this direction. The theses developed both before and during this Conference demonstrated the importance of smashing this trend through ideological struggle so as to facilitate the genuine unity of Marxist-Leninists. (The representative of this trend in our country will be the conservative Central Committee faction that usurped the Center at the Second Conference of the TKP/ML, because the views they defend are essentially the same.)

(It is probable that the Central Committee faction will officially hail the communiqué of this Conference and sign it.)

Another trend that has been gaining ground lately is the nihilist trend that claims there has been nothing Marxist-Leninist left after the death of Stalin. This trend spearheaded by the Canadian group the Bolshevik League is trying to expand its circle of influence.

Both on the international plane and in individual countries, the genuine Marxist-Leninists constitute a small minority today just as the Bolsheviks did in 1914. However, both the disappointment and disbelief that has been created among the working class and toilers by the degeneration of the overwhelming majority of the socialist States upto the present, and the lack of leaders of the stature of a Lenin whose authority was accepted in the various fields of the class struggle and of parties of the perfection of a Bolshevik Party make it all the more difficult for the Bolsheviks of today to accomplish the task facing them, of bringing about the ideological and political unity initially,

and organizational unity gradually, of the World Marxist-Leninist Movement upon a principled Marxist-Leninist basis. Today Marxist-Leninists face many-sided tasks of combat so as to be able to unite the World Marxist-Leninist Movement on a solid foundation. What are these tasks?

First of all, the attacks coming from the ranks of the counter-revolution must be repulsed. Today the most prominent "theoreticians" of the imperialist bourgeoisie all over the globe are trying to spread the "impracticability" of Marxism-Leninism, that Communism is an "illusion", etc. They are spreading sophistries such as that Communism is "against the nature of Man", that "power corrupts men", that "this is inevitable", etc., etc. Pointing their fingers at the degenerate Soviet Union, at the People's Republic of China, they say: "As you see, all is in vain!" These ideological attacks of the bourgeoisie show their effects on the working class and revolutionary ranks. Belief in the cause of Communism is being shaken. To repulse these ideological attacks of the imperialist bourgeoisie, to expose these bourgeois sophistries in the revolutionary ranks, especially among the international working class, is an important task of the day.

The ideological attacks unleashed by the counter-revolution on Marxism-Leninism do not come in the guise of open anti-Communism only. The more ominous of these ideological attacks comes under the guise of Marxism-Leninism.

Today Khrushchevite modern revisionism retains its character of being the most extensive offensive against Marxism-Leninism in the name of Marxism-Leninism during the last few decades and being the prop and root of all revisionist trends and deviations coming in succession to it.

Everyone ought to see the plain truth that, although certain successes were indeed obtained in the ideological struggle against Khrushchev revisionism, this struggle has been insufficient and Khrushchev revisionism has not been repudiated entirely. Revisionism of the Khrushchev type still maintains its domination in the international working-class movement today and continues to occupy the position of being the main enemy of Marxism-Leninism in the ideological plane generally.

A new variant of modern revisionism that appeared in the course of the struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism, by the name of "the Three Worlds Theory", caused great damage in the Marxist-Leninist ranks. A significant section of the theses of this type of modern revisionism still exists in a series of parties which claim to reject the "Three Worlds Theory". Struggle against this type of revisionism, especially the disclosure of the roots and the common aspects of this "theory" with Khrushchevite modern revisionism continues to be an important task of the present-day Marxist-Leninist movement.

Both the modern revisionism of the Khrushchev type and the modern revisionism of the "Three Worlds" type try to conceal themselves behind the veil of Marxism-Leninism. The revisionism of the "Euro-communist" type which became especially fashionable

in the Seventies, also rooted in Khrushchevite modern revisionism, has thrown off all the bridges with Leninism in words as well. With the theses that Leninism is "despotic", that it was only suitable for the tsarist Russia, that the Leninist-type Party organization inevitably leads to bureaucratism, etc., they openly and officially repudiate all the developments of Marxism by Leninism, and cling to the reformist theses of the opportunists of the II. International that are also upheld by many social-democratic parties holding seats of power today. The task as well of struggling against this type of revisionism stands before the Marxist-Leninists.

Today there also exist certain "left" trends that emerged in reaction to the pacifist views particularly of Khrushchev-type modern revisionism, which hang onto the coattails of the theses of modern revisionism on many subjects or are influenced by them. The most widespread among them is the Castroist-Guevaraist line of focoism. Especially widespread in the youth movement, this trend exactly upholds such theses of modern revisionism as "artificial equilibrium", "the period of the third crisis", "impossibility of a new inter-imperialist war of division", etc. The line of action of this trend is the "vanguard warfare" of small, well-trained armed groups (the foco) "against the oligarchy". The importance of the struggle against this trend is obvious.

The restoration in China, and in succession, the line of the Party of Labor of Albania becoming revisionist and the very concrete danger of the degeneration of the PLA and the People's Socialist Republic of Albania coming on the order of the day, has strengthened Trotskyism as well. Trotskyism began to find "response" again. Groups emerged in our country, openly claiming to be Trotskyist. The struggle against Trotskyism at present and in the period ahead stands before us as a task of the struggle to establish the dominance of Marxism-Leninism.

The task is to combat every variant of modern revisionism and Trotskyism, on the one hand, while waging a ruthless struggle against their reflections in the Marxist-Leninist ranks, preserving the purity of Marxism-Leninism, on the other.

> In order to ensure the unity of Marxist-Leninists, it is absolutely necessary to combat the reflections of every variant of revisionism especially in the Marxist-Leninist ranks; to purge the Marxist-Leninist ranks of any deviation from Marxism-Leninism in the course of struggle. Unity must be the unity of Marxist-Leninists on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The only unity that the international working class needs, that can really carry the world proletarian revolution to victory, that can orientate the revolution towards its ultimate aim, Communism, is a unity based on Marxist-Leninist principles. Every other sort of unity is a hollow unity that is doomed to collapse.

Today there are many trends taking on the task of uniting the world's Marxist-Leninists. Here we are not speaking of the international unity that exists to a certain extent among the modern revisionists of the Khrushchev type, of the "Three Worlds" type and the open Trotskyites which they are trying to consolidate, which all speak in the name of Marxism-Leninism but which are openly in the ranks of the counter-revolution.

What concerns us principally here is how the forces outside these approach the question of the unity of Marxist-Leninists and what they do to that end. This is what we wish to dwell on in this article.

The most important erroneous stand among these forces which we ought to touch upon is that of the Party of Labor of Albania and its circle. According to the PLA (and its circle): "Today the World Marxist-Leninist Movement is stronger than it has ever been." "Those who say that the World Marxist-Leninist Movement is in a crisis are bourgeois and revisionists." In reality all important problems have been solved. Leaders of the Party of Labor of Albania, headed by Enver Hoxha, are competing with each other in trying to cover up the questions that occupy the World Marxist-Leninist Movement and they lead the pack in propagating hatred of theory which is presently wreaking such great havoc in the movement. In his polemic with the CPC revisionists, Enver Hoxha says: "A revolutionary situation has gripped, or is in the process of gripping, the majority of the capitalist and revisionist countries. Consequently, this situation has brought revolution on the order of the day." ("Imperialism and the Revolution", p.181, German edition) "For the Chinese revisionists, the question of proletarian revolution and national liberation revolution is not on the order of the day in our times, because, among other reasons, there is not a revolutionary situation anywhere in the world according to their view. Therefore, they urge the proletariat to lock themselves up in libraries to study "theory" because the time for revolutionary action is not ripe yet." (Ibidem, p.196)

In reality, here Enver Hoxha and the PLA leadership are employing the method of "beating the saddle but meaning the donkey". An important characteristic of the "Chinese revisionists" is their hatred of theory. Because the study and grasping of Marxist-Leninist theory by the proletariat means a shortening of the life of revisionists. For this reason, the "Chinese revisionists" have not in any place called upon the proletariat "to lock themselves up in libraries" to study "theory". (Like our theory-haters, Enver Hoxha grasps theoretical work as divorcing oneself from the class struggle! For Enver Hoxha, too, doing theoretical work means shutting oneself up in a library! Here one can see how our "theory" hating narrow-practicalists unite with Enver Hoxha on this point, whom they attack furiously!)(2) Nonetheless, Hoxha pretends as if the Chinese revisionists did make such a call, and attacks the windmills created by none other than himself. The target is obvious: To hit at those who find the way out of the present ideological confusion in embracing the principles of Marxism-Leninism, who stress the importance of theoretical work today. In his book "Imperialism and the Revolution", Enver Hoxha makes the following out-of-context quotation from

Marx: "Every step of real movement is more important than a dozen programmes." Against opportunists of the Rabocheye Dyelo who cited the same quotation in 1902 when theoretical disorder was prevalent, Lenin said:

> "'Every step of real movement is more important than a dozen programmes.' To repeat these words in a period of theoretical disorder is like wishing mourners at a funeral many happy returns of the day." (Lenin, "What is to be done?", Selected Works in three volumes, Vol.I, p.138, Moscow 1970)

While the present sorry state of the World Marxist-Leninist Movement is there for all to see, in a situation where many questions that were solved both theoretically and practically by Marxism-Leninism are facing us again today as "problems" as a result of the revisionist betrayal, in a situation where the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism are brazenly distorted, in a situation where the tasks of thoroughly investigating the causes of restoration are facing us, in a period of theoretical disorder, Enver Hoxha imitates the opportunists of Russia and takes the road of covering up the problems.

For Enver Hoxha and other leaders of the Party of Labor of Albania, there is only one thing to do to accomplish the unity of Marxist-Leninists: To accept the present revisionist line put out by the PLA as a Marxist-Leninist line and form a chain around the PLA. Those who do not do so, those making the smallest bit of public criticism against the line of the PLA are "excommunicated". The Party of Labor of Albania and its circle are afraid of the public criticism of their errors and deviations. It is obvious for anyone with the most rudimentary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism that this is no solution.

Another proposal towards ensuring the unity of the International Marxist-Leninist Movement comes from the Canadian group In Struggle!. Essentially, this group does not consider the differences between the Party of Labor of Albania, on the one hand, and the groups opposing the revisionist line of the PLA which totally rejects Mao and the gains of the Chinese revolution, on the other hand, decisive, and is of the opinion that both the PLA and its circle, and the groups opposing the line of the PLA can and should come together. Although this group criticizes the PLA in places, it generally holds centrist positions. An international unity trying to be created on the basis of this understanding is a hollow unity right from the start.

Another initiative comes from the Bolshevik League, also from Canada. This group proposes to take the stand against the danger of an imperialist world war as the point of departure for unity. In line with this understanding, this group proposed a joint communiqué with a content of preventing the imperialist war through revolution, and turning the war into civil war in the case of an outbreak of imperialist war. In fact, this communiqué can be undersigned by almost any group. But the Bolshevik League declared that those who refused to sign this communiqué would be opportunists. ("International Correspondence", No. 2, August 1980)

Today such a general appeal cannot be a criterion for demarcating ourselves from opportunism. An historical example of this was witnessed at the Basel Conference in 1912. There all social-democratic parties put their signatures to such a general appeal. But when war broke out, things changed. Today such a general appeal would obscure the task of "drawing firm and definite lines of demarcation" that is necessary "before we can unite and in order that we may unite". It would present a non-existent unity as existing. Such a unity would look solid from the outside, but in reality it would be a hollow one. What the World Marxist-Leninist Movement needs today is not such non-descript, hollow unity, but a solid unity on the basis of a solid platform. The task is to work to achieve this.

At the start of 1980, the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA and the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile appeared on the scene with the claim of taking a step in the direction of fulfilling this task by proposing an International Conference. In the remainder of this article we wish to dwell on this Conference at some length, some documents of which we publish in the present issue , for this Conference covered some distance in internationally organizing and strengthening another significant deviation that has certain chances of development on the basis of the reaction to the Party of Labor of Albania, and a suitable environment exists for the views of this Conference to spread in revolutionary and Marxist-Leninist ranks. Criticism of the views and methods of this Conference at the same time means the elucidation of our own views on how to achieve the unity of the World Marxist-Leninist Movement and what are our tasks for its accomplishment.

## THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE CONFERENCE

Sending a letter of invitation to various parties and groups in early 1980, the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA and the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile (RCP, USA and RCP Ch respectively) informed that they would be organizing a Conference to take a step in the direction of "reconstructing the unity of the Marxist-Leninist movement". On the subject of participation in the Conference, the following was written in the letter:

> "Our two parties have issued the invitation to this meeting to parties and organizations who fit the following criteria:
>
> 1) Those who have broken with the Chinese revisionists, including their international line of capitulation to imperialism, and who continue to oppose Soviet-style modern revisionism.

2) Those who continue to uphold the great contributions of Mao Tsetung to Marxism-Leninism, including his teachings on continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and the achievements of the Cultural Revolution.

3) Those parties and organizations who wage an implacable struggle for the overthrow of their own reactionary ruling class. This requires, especially in the imperialist countries, a rejection of every form of social-chauvinism and the upholding of Lenin's teachings that in the event of imperialist war the proletariat cannot defend the imperialist "fatherland" but must strive for the defeat of its own bourgeoisie.

4) Those who in theory and practice support the struggle of the proletariat throughout the world; support the struggle of the oppressed nations for genuine national liberation; and defend socialism where it exists or has existed and wherever it may be established in the future." (from the letter of February 13, 1980, pp.3/4) (Underlined by us)

While claiming to take steps in the direction of "reconstructing the unity of the World Marxist-Leninist Movement" in early 1980 on the one hand, but stipulating the above criteria for participants in the Conference for achieving this unity on the other, was completely wrong. Because the second among the above criteria was a criterion which laid down, in the name of defending Mao Zedong, the defence of his errors as a criterion of Marxism-Leninism. For here:
a) Mao Zedong's teaching on continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat was depicted as a criterion of Marxism-Leninism. This is wrong, for Mao Zedong's views on the subject, propagandized as a "contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory", especially his view that, "in the conditions of China, one section of the bourgeoisie will take part in socialist construction", does not represent Marxism-Leninism, but a deviation from it. On the subject of "new bourgeoisie" and the "danger of restoration" flowing from it, which Lenin and Stalin touched on previously, although Mao Zedong advanced the Marxist-Leninist theory in certain measure, he did not contribute to the theory on a fundamentally new basis and solve the problem completely;
b) the defence of the achievements of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was presented as a criterion of being Marxist-Leninist, but the question of what was understood from these achievements concretely was not adressed. This was also wrong because, contrary to the assertions of many people, although the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was an act of political revolution against the open modern revisionist elements in the circumstances of modern revisionists usurping power in the Party and State, it also contained significant mistakes. For instance, in the course of this revolutionary movement, a consistent self-criticism of the past was not forthcoming. Contrary to the assertions of many people, the Cultural Revolution in the shape it assumed in China was not of universal validity.

All these were topics of discussion in the World Communist Movement at the beginning of 1980, and the discussion was at an initial stage then. (At present, one could not say that this discussion has progressed sufficiently, that lines of demarcation on the subject have acquired full clarification.) In this situation, to present the above criteria as criteria whose acceptance was obligatory in order to be able to participate in a meeting held with the declared aim of "facilitating the unity of Marxist-Leninists" meant excluding, right from the outset, those assessing Mao Zedong as a Marxist-Leninist having significant errors and deviations.

Hence the real aim of the organizers of this meeting revealed itself. In reality, they wished to facilitate, in the name of facilitating the unity of Marxist-Leninists, the unity of those assessing Mao Zedong as "having not made significant errors". The basis on which they strove to unite the World Marxist-Leninist Movement was not Marxism-Leninism, but what they termed "Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought".

Organizers of this meeting stipulated "hav(ing) broken with ... their (the Chinese revisionists' --Translator's note) international line of capitulation to imperialism" as part of the first criterion whose fulfilment was necessary for the participants. Indeed, this was a correct criterion (the third and fourth criteria being correct too). But a study of the "Outline for position paper on the basic principles for the unity of Marxist-Leninists and the line of the communist movement internationally) (Draft)(henceforward "Outline for position paper" --Translator's note) that was enclosed with this letter(x), and especially a study of the detailed exposition (entitled "Basic principles for the unity of Marxist-Leninists and for the line of the International Communist Movement", henceforward "Basic principles" --Translator's note) (See document no.2, a summary of this exposition) showed that, in the hands of the organizers, this criterion turned into something that left much to be desired. "The theory of capitulation to imperialism" with which the RCP, USA and RCP Ch demanded to have broken was none other than the "Theory of the Three Worlds". Yet, like many Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary groups, the RCP, USA and RCP Ch, which laid down breaking with this theory as a criterion for participation in the meeting, have themselves still not yet radically broken with the "Three Worlds Theory". And they continue upholding one of the most important points of departure for the "Three Worlds Theory", i.e., the understanding of the "two supwepowers", which is nothing but the "first World" (of the "Three Worlds Theory--Translator's note) in disguise.

A Conference raising itself on such a basis could not have been a step on the part of Marxist-Leninists of the world, but a step on the part of the parties and groups, the majority of them still in the ranks of the World Marxist-Leninist Movement, which uphold a deviation that considers Mao Zedong one of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. In fact, that is exactly what happened.

## THE METHODS EMPLOYED AT THE PREPARATORY STAGE OF THE CONFERENCE WERE NOT MARXIST-LENINIST

The methods employed at the preparatory stage of the Conference were those of administrative measures and conspiracy not only in organizational matters but also in ideological questions.

Administrative measures manifested themselves in the "criteria for participation" that were laid down, in declaring those thinking differently on the question of Mao "outside' the World Marxist-Leninist Movement" right from the outset, and in running away from open ideological struggle with them before as well as after the Conference.

Conspiracy in ideological questions manifested itself in keeping the prepared draft resolutions and the detailed "Basic principles" secret from the whole of the World Marxist-Leninist Movement, in communicating these documents only to those parties and groups whose participation was desirable. Whereas, the ideological and political issues that were dealt with in the "Outline for position paper" and in the "Basic principles" were topics on which the entire World Marxist-Leninist Movement was conducting a long-standing discussion. Laying the platform proposal open before Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries of the whole world, making it public, submitting it to the scrutiny and criticism of all Marxist-Leninists, the open and public discussion of these drafts would undoubtedly contribute towards clarifying the "lines of demarcation that are necessary to draw before we unite and in order that we may unite". Laying the drafts open to public scrutiny would at the same time help the Marxist-Leninists in seeing the differences between the drafts and the accepted documents, and the organizing parties would be compelled to lay open to public scrutiny the arguments behind the differences and the ideological / political discussion and struggle conducted at the meeting. In this way, the revolutionary masses would not be lulled to sleep with lullabies of a "solid unity", etc. that does not really exist; they would see the situation as it really is, i.e., they would see the differences of opinion and ideological struggle between the parties and groups; and they would be given the chance of knowingly taking sides in the event of a disintegration, rather than just supporting one of the sides, as a fan does, say, in a game of football.

The existing practices of covering up the differences of opinion and conducting ideological discussion and struggle behind closed doors are revisionist methods introduced by the Khrushchev revisionists into the World Marxist-Leninist Movement (and which they forced the Marxist-Leninists to accept in 1957 and 1960) which must absolutely be smashed. It is only normal that revisionists should backtrack from and fear the open and public conduct of ideological struggle, for open ideological struggle conducted before the public would, in the long run, expose and isolate them among the advanced elements of the working class and revolutionary masses. That is the reason why, now on the

pretext of "unity", then on the pretext of "security", etc., they run away from open ideological struggle before the public. (Only insofar as there is no chance of an escape do they accept open ideological struggle.) As for Marxist-Leninists, on questions of ideological differences they take the struggle before the broadest possible public as their method, for that is the only correct way of educating the party as well as the revolutionary masses. Open and public struggle with revisionist views gives the party and the party members the chance of testing their correct views in the course of battling with wrong views, in the course of practice, and develops the party. Open struggle between revisionist views and Marxist-Leninist views before the public gives the revolutionary masses the chance of personally recognizing the correct views in the course of their clashes with false views, in the course of practical struggle; the chance of advancement, of receiving education, in being able to distinguish the correct from the false; and advances the revolutionary masses.

The choice, on the part of the Conference organizers, of the method of discussing ideological questions "behind closed doors", and only with those whom they consider close to themselves at that, is a product of the suspicions they have about their own views. Their choice of revisionist methods cannot be explained otherwise.

In our practice upto the present, we have seen and had first-hand experience of who ran away from open ideological struggle. For instance, the Party of Labor of Albania had not invited some of its fraternal parties --the Marxist-Leninist Party of Austria (MLPÖ), for example-- to the "Scientific Conference" held in 1978, at which it renounced Mao Zedong wholesale. For the PLA knew that the MLPÖ thought differently on Mao Zedong, that the MLPÖ would defend its own views in the event of its participation in this meeting. The method employed by the PLA was a revisionist method, a method employed to hide its fear of and running away from open ideological struggle.

For instance, in August 1979, at the international youth camp organized by the parties around the Party of Labor of Albania, representatives of a series of Marxist-Leninist and democratic organizations were not allowed into the camp (TKP/ML; ATIF/ATÖF); representatives and sympathizers of some organizations were thrown out of the camp ("Against the Tide"(GDS), "West Berlin Communist"(WBK), Communist Party of Cyprus/Marxist-Leninist (Organizing Committee)(KKP/ML(ÖK))); some organizations were not given a chance to propagate their own views(MLPÖ, RCP Ch) and things went so far as resorting to brute force against representatives of the RCP Ch. The organizers of the international youth camp did not refrain from openly collaborating with the fascist Spanish police against the communists and revolutionaries organized in TKP/ML, ATIF and ATÖF, Why? Because they wanted to prevent open and public ideological struggle at all costs. The method they employed was a revisionist method.

And now those who appear on the scene as "the most consistent defenders" of Mao Zedong, as the most consistent defenders of the 'Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution', also employ the methods taken over from the Khrushchev modern revisionists. The method employed by the RCP, USA and RCP Ch in the preparation of the Conference they organized clearly shows this. At the same time, it also shows that they did not understand one single whit the most important lesson of the Cultural Revolution which they claim to uphold, namely, the lesson of open ideological struggle against revisionism within and before the masses.

The Conference organizers employed a revisionist method not only in not submitting the preparatory documents of the Conference to the public and keeping them secret, but also in the policy of invitation, which revisionist method is also used by the Party of Labor of Albania and its circle. The method is as follows: Do not invite those who do not suit the organizers, those whose views are known to be different from the organizers. That is, the method of exclusion. The easiest and surest way of doing this is to lay down "criteria" which, in advance, are known to be unacceptable to those whose participation is not desirable. The Conference organizers acted in this fashion. In doing so, they revealed that their main goal was not to arrive at a solid unity as a result of a principled struggle against existing ideological differences, but rather announcing, by way of a joint communiqué, the already existing unity --or presumed unity-- with those accepting the criteria laid down by themselves.

The methods "borrowed" from the Party of Labor of Albania and its circle, whom the Conference organizers claim to strongly(!) criticize, do not rest there. In addition, as the revisionist chieftains of the Communist Party of Germany/Marxist-Leninist (KPD/ML) and the Communist Party of Spain/Marxist-Leninist (PCE/ML) did on the eve of the joint declaration of the 18 parties on the occasion of the Year of Stalin, the RCP, USA and RCP Ch announced themselves the "center", the "organizers of the meeting". They did not take the road of holding a preliminary meeting with representatives of all parties and organizations that promised to participate and forming an Organizing Committee elected by all participant groups on a basis of equality.

The Conference organizers did not take a clear stand about the participant groups, about which grounds some of the invited groups proffered for not participating, or about why certain groups were not invited, etc.

All these are given facts which go to show that the methods employed at the preparatory stage of the Conference were revisionist methods. The same methods were maintained in the aftermath of the Conference as well, and the differences of opinion which developed in the course of the discussions conducted at the Conference; the grounds of why some parties partaking in the Conference refused to sign the communiqué; the reasons behind the differences between the draft text and the communiqué, etc. have not been made public. The method employed is not one of delving

into the ideological differences, a method of open struggle over these differences conducted in public, but a method of covering up and concealing the existing ideological differences.

## THE LINE OF THE CONFERENCE APPEAL "TO THE MARXIST-LENINISTS, THE WORKERS, AND THE OPPRESSED OF ALL COUNTRIES" IS BUILT ON TWO IMPORTANT DEVIATIONS

One of the two fundamental deviations on which the Conference appeal raises itself is "MAO ZEDONG THOUGHT". As is well-known, the term "Mao Zedong Thought" gained wide currency in the aftermath of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China and it is understood in the World Marxist-Leninist Movement as its content was defined during the Cultural Revolution:

> "Today we are in a new era of the world revolution.... The tendency of imperialism's total collapse and the victory of Socialism throughout the world has become an irreversible tendency." (Important documents of the GPCR, Peking 1970, pp.186/187; from the "Announcement of the 11th Plenum of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China", August 12, 1966, in German) (Underlined by us)
>
> "Comrade Mao Zedong is the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our time. With a creativity befitting a genius, comrade Mao Zedong completely took over, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism. Mao Zedong raised Marxism-Leninism to a completely new level.
>
> MAO ZEDONG THOUGHT IS THE MARXISM-LENINISM OF THE ERA OF IMPERIALISM GOING TOWARDS ITS TOTAL COLLAPSE AND SOCIALISM MARCHING ONTO WORLDWIDE VICTORY." (Ibidem, p.194)

The same views are propagated in nearly all documents of the Cultural Revolution; in the Foreword to the second edition of the "Red Book"; in the "Report to the Ninth Party Congress" of the Communist Party of China, which was adopted unanimously; in "The General Program" section of the amended Constitution of the CP of China at the same Congress, etc.

In the clearest elucidation of "Mao Zedong Thought", i.e., as it is defended by Lin Piao, this understanding of "Mao Zedong Thought" sets out from our present era (the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions) having altered; a new era (the era of the total collapse of imperialism and the worldwide victory of Socialism) having begun; consequently, many principles of Leninism having become outmoded; and the necessity of developing Marxism-Leninism in line with the prerequisites of the new era, of raising Marxism-Leninism to a completely new level; and Mao Zedong having accomplished this. According to this understanding, it is not enough to speak of Marxism-Leninism anymore, we must speak of "Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought".

This understanding, accepted at the Ninth Party Congress of the CP of China and reflecting itself onto the lines of the CPC and many other Marxist-Leninist parties (TKP/ML being among them), was altered in at least one point at the X. Party Congress of the CPC (without, however, a self-criticism!!!), and it was stressed that we were still living in the "era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions", that Leninism was not out-moded, it was still "the theoretical basis guiding our practice".

After the X. Party Congress of the CP of China having presented the matter in this light, many advocates of "Mao Zedong Thought" reviewed their stands on this question: some of them, having brought forth the connection between every form of the understanding of "Mao Zedong Thought" and the rejection of Marxism-Leninism, refused further use of this term (see, for instance, the Self-Criticism of the TKP/ML); and some others continued to defend "Mao Zedong Thought" by striving to make it "compatible" with Leninism (as the RCP Ch, RCP, USA and the current shaping up around them do). The criticisms brought on this score have compelled them to redefine the content of the term "Mao Zedong Thought".

Results of this compulsion can bee seen in the Conference documents. In the "Outline for position paper" submitted by the two parties, the following was said on this score:

> "Mao Tsetung Thought is not something different than Marxism-Leninism, nor is it the Marxism-Leninism of some new era, different than the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution; Mao Tsetung Thought represents an enrichment and development of Marxism-Leninism on many fronts and the theoretical concentration of historic experience of the proletarian revolution over the last several decades." ("Outline for position paper", section 2, point 4, pp.6/7) (Underlined by us)

Now, we ought to pose the following question to the advocates of this view: If, in deed, "Mao Zedong Thought" is not something different from Marxism-Leninism, why feel the urge to use the term "Mao Zedong Thought" all the same? Advocates of this view answer this question in continuation of their theses:

> "Mao Tsetung Thought represents an enrichment and development of Marxism-Leninism on many fronts and the theoretical concentration of historic experience of the proletarian revolution over the last several decades."

Were we to expand on this, it would mean the following: The historic experience of the proletarian revolution over the last several decades, the problems that have cropped up during this period could not be solved by Leninism anymore, they could not be solved comprehensively on the basis of Leninism. The theory needed to be advanced to solve these questions. And Mao Zedong Thought did precisely this.

Such is the operation performed by the RCP, USA and RCP Ch, the original "contribution" made by them, to reject the validity of Leninism and to put "Mao Zedong Thought" in its place. However, neither in the way Lin Piao did it nor in the way the RCP, USA and RCP Ch do it, the essence of the defence of "Mao Zedong Thought" does not change: renunciation of Leninism; rejection of the reality that present-day questions can and must be solved on the basis of Leninism, on the basis of the works of Marxist-Leninist classics, of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

The replacement of Leninism with "Mao Zedong Thought" 'on the basis of the historic experience over the last several decades' means looking for the causes of the negative developments over the last several decades in Leninism, in its "falseness" or its "insufficiency". Quite to the contrary, the negative developments over the last several decades are not consequences of the insufficiency or falseness of the universal principles of Leninism, but rather consequences of the violations of the basic universal principles of Leninism, their rejection upon the pretext of "new conditions"; of completely betraying them. Precisely the "historic experience" over the last several decades has shown very clearly that it is necessary to rely on Leninism, on the principles of Leninism, to solve the questions. This historic experience has shown that Marxism-Leninism leads to victory, and every deviation from it --be it right or 'left'-- leads to defeat.

The task of Marxist-Leninists is not to polish up and offer "Mao Zedong Thought" on the market again, which is advanced in the belief and with the understanding that Leninism is outmoded, but to defend the principles of Leninism which the revisionists of all sorts try to bury. The RCP, USA and RCP Ch fail to carry out this task.

The problem is not one of developing Marxism-Leninism in certain measure. In point of fact, every revolutionary movement contributes to the development of the Marxist-Leninist theory in the final analysis. Theory is the summation of the experience of the working-class movement of all countries. In this sense every revolutionary movement advances the theory, contributes to it in certain measure. This is also the case with the Chinese revolution. The summation of the experiences of the Chinese revolution by Mao Zedong has advanced the Marxist-Leninist theory. In particular, the achievements of the People's Democratic Revolution in China is a treasurehouse of experience that has advanced the theory of Marxism-Leninism. Similarly, despite all its errors and shortcomings, the negative as well as the positive experiences of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, an uprising against the revisionists holding power, is also a treasurehouse which has advanced, and will advance, the Marxist-Leninist theory. But advocates of "Mao Zedong Thought" do not imply such an "advancement" and "enrichment". If they did indeed imply this, then it would be altogether incomprehensible why they did not say, for instance, the "Thought of Dimitrov", "Thought of Enver Hoxha", or the "Thought of Stalin" (and there remains the fact that

Stalin's contributions to Marxist-Leninist theory were incomparably greater than the others', including Mao Zedong's). What they understand from "Mao Zedong Thought" is, in particular, Mao Zedong's "contribution" on the capitalist restoration to the Marxist-Leninist theory, which did not exist prior to him. They are of the opinion that Mao Zedong corrected the "errors" of Stalin on this score. Such is precisely the understanding pushing them to defend "Mao Zedong Thought".

The things said on this score in the joint communiqué signed by the 13 parties and organizations at the end of the Conference are quite clear. While defining "Mao Zedong Thought" there it is said:

> "We are still living in the era of Leninism, of imperialism and the proletarian revolution; AT THE SAME TIME WE AFFIRM THAT MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT IS A NEW STAGE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MARXISM-LENINISM." (See the "communiqué", p.10) (Capitalized and underlined by us)

Here a further step was taken than the draft submitted by the RCP, USA and RCP Ch, a further step taken towards "Mao Zedong Thought" as it was understood by Lin Piao, and it was announced that "Mao Zedong Thought" was "a new stage in the development of Marxism-Leninism". It seems that this was a "correction" being made after criticisms by the Reorganization Committee of the Communist Party of India/Marxist-Leninist, which accused these two parties of "being influenced by the Party of Labor of Albania". To claim what is called "Mao Zedong Thought" to be "a new stage in the development of Marxism-Leninism" is nothing other than announcing the outmodedness of Leninism. Lin Piao said so openly, now his followers say so in various disguises. However, the essence of the problem does not change.

The following is said in the joint communiqué on "Mao Zedong Thought" and on the stand towards Mao Zedong:

> "Upholding the contribution of Mao Tsetung to the science of Marxism-Leninism represents a particularly important and pressing question in the international communist movement and among the class conscious workers today. The principle involved is nothing less than whether or not to uphold and build on decisive contributions to the proletarian revolution and the science of Marxism-Leninism made by Mao. Mao Tsetung made important developments of Marxism-Leninism on the area of the anti-imperialist democratic revolution leading to socialism, people's war and military strategy generally, philosophy (where he made important contributions on the analysis of contradictions, which is the essence of dialectics, and on the theory of knowledge and its links with practise and the mass line), revolutionizing the superstructure and continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, as well as in the struggle against revisionism on the practical and theoretical fronts. It is therefore nothing less than the question of whether to uphold Marxism-Leninism itself. Mao's theoretical and

> practical leadership represent a quantitative and qualitative development of Marxism-Leninism on many fronts and the theoretical concentration of the historical experience of the proletarian revolution over the last several decades." (Ibidem, pp.9/10)

As one can see, here the signatory parties declare, according to their assessment, first that Mao Zedong made contributions to Marxism-Leninism. In their view, Mao Zedong made contributions to Marxism-Leninism on the following points (together with the author's comments thereon --Translator's note):

1- Anti-imperialist democratic revolution leading to socialism

o On this point Mao Zedong correctly combined the correct theses advanced by Lenin, Stalin and the Comintern with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution, summed up the experience of the Chinese revolution, and in this sense advanced the Marxist-Leninist theory. To fail to take into account the fact that Lenin, Stalin and the Comintern theoretically solved the questions of the anti-imperialist democratic revolution leading to socialism means exaggerating the contributions made by Mao on this point.

2- People's war and military strategy generally

o Indeed, the thesis that, under certain conditions, the revolution could develop from the countryside towards the city, emerged during the experience of the Chinese revolution, and was developed mainly by Mao Zedong. The military articles of Mao Zedong are important contributions to the treasury of Marxism-Leninism on this point.

3- Philosophy

o Mao Zedong's articles on this subject try to combine Marxist-Leninist philosophy with questions of the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. In places, however, he slides into schematism in these articles. While trying to put things across in a simple way, in places he falls into schematism. Contrary to the assertions of advocates of "Mao Zedong Thought", Mao Zedong did not make important contributions to Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

4- Revolutionizing the superstructure

o Advocates of "Mao Zedong Thought" assert that it was Mao Zedong who first developed views on revolutionizing the superstructure. This is false. Lenin as well as Stalin stressed numerous times that it was not enough to construct the socialist infrastructure only, but equally to revolutionize the superstructure; and very concrete steps were taken in this direction in the Soviet Union.

5- Continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat

Advocates of "Mao Zedong Thought" assert that the Marxist-Leninists prior to Mao Zedong did not solve the question of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. By solving this problem, Mao Zedong made a contribution to Marxism-Leninism on this score. This claim has no ground to stand on either. In miscellaneous articles, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin pointed out that the "dictatorship of the proletariat" was a necessary intermediate stage for the transition to Communism; that it was not the end, but only the beginning of the revolution; that revolution must be continued uninterruptedly. In the Soviet Union, revolution was continued under the "dictatorship of the proletariat" too in the period of leadership of Lenin and Stalin. Mao did not add anything new on this score to the Marxist-Leninist theory. What is new in him on this score, that is, his stand of considering a section of the bourgeoisie "inside the dictatorship of the proletariat in the conditions of China", is not a contribution to Marxism-Leninism, but a deviation from it. Also, his view on the new bourgeoisie is a development, on the basis of the experiences gained in the Soviet Union and China, of the views advanced by Lenin and Stalin, albeit in embryonic form, and is not something new.

6- Struggle against revisionism

Advocates of "Mao Zedong Thought" exaggerate the "contributions" of Mao Zedong on this score, too, and pass the sponge over his errors. It is a historical fact that the Communist Party of China under Mao Zedong's leadership waged struggle against Khrushchevite modern revisionism. Yet, in the course of this struggle, a) that the CPC itself was in a revisionist course of deviation on some points (for instance, the question of constructing socialism with a section of the bourgeoisie in the conditions of China); b) that the CPC saw Khrushchevite modern revisionism as a systematically revisionist line only too late; c) that, in the name of preserving unity, the CPC tried to strike a bargain over some questions of principle with the Khrushchev revisionists; d) that, although important achievements were obtained in the struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism, Khrushchev revisionism was not smashed, etc., are equally historical facts. The CPC's "struggle against revisionism" under Mao Zedong's leadership did not contribute anything new to Marxism-Leninism.

7- Theoretical concentration of the historical experience of the proletarian revolution over the last several decades

What the advocates of "Mao Zedong Thought" mean by the last several decades ought probably to be the period after the emergence of Khrushchevite modern revisionism. Four important events of this period that are of decisive significance from the point of view of the international Marxist-Leninist Movement are the

following: the struggle against modern revisionism of the Khrushchev type; the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution; the deviation that emerged during and after the Cultural Revolution under the signboard of "Mao Zedong Thought" which claimed Leninism was outdated, and the stand toward it; and lastly, revisionism of the "Theory of the Three Worlds" and the stand toward it.

Of these four events, we evaluated the one dealing with modern revisionism of the Khrushchev type above. The lessons drawn from the historical experience on this score by Mao Zedong and the CP of China under his leadership are insufficient and in places contain significant errors.

On the question of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution too the question of what were its significant lessons from the point of view of the world proletariat was not sufficiently clarified theoretically by Mao Zedong and the CP of China under his leadership. A scientific evaluation of this revolution failed to be made and the necessary lessons to be learnt from it by the entire world proletariat were not brought out. Insofar as any assessments were made of the Cultural Revolution, they did not go beyond the level of short agitational articles.

Also, there is no documentary evidence showing that Mao Zedong and the Communist Party of China under his leadership waged a sufficient struggle against the anti-Marxist anti-Leninist trend of "Mao Zedong Thought" developing during and after the Cultural Revolution. Even after the ouster of Lin Piao, the number one defender of these views, his theoretical views were not repudiated satisfactorily by the CPC under leadership of Mao Zedong. The "historical experience" of this struggle was not "theoretically concentrated" by Mao Zedong.

As for the counter-revolutionary "Three Worlds Theory" developing in the Seventies and causing great devastation inside the World Marxist-Leninist Movement, there is no documentary evidence indicating that either Mao Zedong himself or the Communist Party of China under his leadership in his lifetime conducted a consistent struggle against this counter-revolutionary theory. Quite the reverse. It is possible to find the roots of some of the views on which the "Three Worlds theoreticians" raise themselves in Mao Zedong's original articles. The historical experience gained by the world proletariat in the struggle against the "Three Worlds Theory" was not theoretically concentrated by Mao Zedong and the CPC led by him. (3)

> Taken as a whole, one can see at once that the arguments advanced by the advocates of "Mao Zedong Thought" to prove that Mao Zedong "developed Marxism-Leninism", "raised it to a new level", that, therefore, it is correct to use the term "Mao Zedong Thought" for this new level, are hollow and unproved. They are the products of an understanding and an approach that overvalues Mao Zedong, underestimates his errors in places and sometimes represents some of these errors even as contributions to Marxism-Leninism.

Equally, it is inevitable that advocates of "Mao Zedong Thought" should arrive at the following false conclusions by proceeding from their false premise that Mao Zedong is a leader raising Marxism-Leninism to a new level:

> "... It (that is, the assessment and defence of Mao Zedong as it is done by the RCP, USA and RCP Ch --Author's note) is therefore nothing less than the question of whether to uphold Marxism-Leninism itself."
>
> "... Without upholding and building on Mao's contributions (we have seen above which 'contributions' of his they mean-- Author's note) it is not possible to defeat revisionism, imperialism and reaction in general." (See the "communiqué", p.10) (Underlined by us)

Here it is seen at once that signatory parties very clearly equate Marxism-Leninism with what they call "Mao Zedong Thought". Contrary to these advocates of "Mao Zedong Thought", we say that "Mao Zedong Thought" and Marxism-Leninism do not mean one and the same thing; that the main task --from the point of view of Marxist-Leninists-- today is the defence of Marxist-Leninist principles against every sort of attack and distortion; that the theory and practice of Mao Zedong can be assessed only in the light and on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. We hold that, in order to defeat revisionism, imperialism and reaction, we should defend and rely on not what is called "Mao Zedong Thought", but precisely on Marxism-Leninism. We say: the thesis that Mao Zedong qualitatively developed Marxism-Leninism is a wrong thesis.

Also, the signatory parties distort the question once more by pretending that Mao Zedong's views and "Mao Zedong Thought" are one and the same thing. Even though what is offered as "Mao Zedong Thought" relies on the views of Mao Zedong and sets out from them, these two things are not one and the same thing. The correct attitude to Mao Zedong is to uphold his genuine contributions to Marxism-Leninism, to criticize and reject his errors. Today our task on this score is a correct defence of Mao Zedong by setting our feet firmly on solid ground against both those who say there was nothing correct in Mao Zedong, who say he was no Marxist-Leninist; and those who, in the name of defending Mao Zedong, defend "Mao Zedong Thought". The signatory parties and groups which lay claim to be the most "consistent" defenders of Mao Zedong today in fact do not defend Mao Zedong, but what is called "Mao Zedong Thought". By equating the defence of Mao Zedong with the defence of "Mao Zedong Thought", the signatory parties have made it impossible to find a way out of the question. We are of the opinion that a real defence of Mao Zedong should also include the task of rejecting the anti-Leninist "Mao Zedong Thought".

The second deviation of the Conference concerns the Leninist theory of imperialism.

## LENINISM'S UNDERSTANDING OF "IMPERIALIST GREAT POWERS" OR THE "THREE WORLDITES" UNDERSTANDING OF "TWO SUPERPOWERS" ?

Lenin in his book entitled "Imperialism—the highest stage of capitalism", written in 1916, made a scientific analysis of imperialism, and identified five of its basic features as the following:

> "(1) the concentration of production and capital has developed to such a high stage that it has created monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life; (2) the merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and the creation, on the basis of this "finance capital", of a financial oligarchy; (3) the export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance; (4) the formation of international monopolist capitalist associations which share the world among themselves, and (5) the territorial division of the whole world among the biggest capitalist powers is completed." (Lenin, Selected Works in three volumes, Volume I, p.737)

In the same work, Lenin stresses that "an essential feature of imperialism is the rivalry between several great powers in the striving for hegemony". (Op. cit., p.739)

Again in the same work and in miscellaneous articles written during the same period, Lenin illustrates the term "imperialist great powers" as those powers which "have mainly partitioned the world territorially", "practically come to the fore in the striving for world hegemony", "come to the fore on the subject of imperialist war also as they are in conflict with others with a view to world hegemony", and thereby differentiates "imperialist great powers" (i.e., those really striving for world hegemony) from other, ordinary imperialist powers (i.e., those that are imperialist in essence, but are not in a position to contend for world hegemony as regards their strength).

In making such a differentiation, however, Lenin in no way tries to present to the world proletariat only the imperialist great powers as the target of the world proletarian revolution, but, on the contrary, the whole imperialist system as its target that must be smashed. He refuses to support one imperialist robber, to unite with it, against another robber in principle. From the standpoint of the tasks of the proletariat in each country, this means that the class(es) holding power in each country must be considered the first target to be struck, that the struggle against the bourgeoisie of one's own country holding state power in its hands must be taken as the central task. In the concrete conditions of 1916, Lenin assessed the British, German, American, Russian, Japanese and French imperialisms as imperialist great powers, and he took into hand and investigated one by one the particular features of each of these great powers. For instance, he wrote that, among these great powers "are three states which dominate the world: Germany, Great Britain and the United States" from the viewpoint of "highly developed capitalism". (Op. cit., p.742)

While approaching the problem from the viewpoint of colonial possessions, Lenin wrote the following about these "great powers":

> "... among the six countries mentioned we see, firstly, young capitalist countries (America, Germany, Japan) whose progress has been extraordinarily rapid; secondly, countries with an old capitalist development (France and Great Britain), whose progress lately has been much slower that that of the previously mentioned countries, and thirdly, a country most backward economically (Russia), where modern capitalist imperialism is enmeshed, so to speak, in a particularly close network of pre-capitalist relations." (Op. cit., p.731)

Approaching the problem from the stabdpoint of the holding of "securities", etc., Lenin wrote the following:

> "From the figures we see at once standing out in sharp relief four of the richest capitalist countries, each of which holds securities to amounts ranging approximately from 100 000 to 150 000 million francs. Of these four countries, two, Britain and France, are the oldest capitalist countries, and, as we shall see, possess the most colonies; the other two, the United States and Germany, are capitalist countries leading in the rapidity of development and the degree of extension of capitalist monopolies in industry. Together, these four countries own 479 000 million francs, that is, nearly 80 per cent of the world's finance capital. In one way or another, nearly the whole of the rest of the world is more or less the debtor to and tributary of these international banker countries, these four "pillars" of world finance capital." (Op. cit., p.715)

About the countries coming to the fore in the incitement of war, he records the concrete situation with the following remarks:

> "... a war to decide whether the British or German group of financial plunderers is to receive the most booty ..." (Op. cit., p.675)(Preface to the French and German editions)

> "... Capitalism has grown into a world system of colonial oppression and of the financial strangulation of the overwhelming majority of the population of the world by a handful of "advanced" countries. And this "booty" is shared between two or three powerful world plunderers armed to the teeth (America, Great Britain, Japan), who are drawing the whole world into <u>their</u> war over the division of <u>their</u> booty." (Op. cit., p.674)

In the first quote here, Lenin concretely referred to the imperialist great powers which <u>had headed up</u> the two groups of financial plunderers that stoked the fires of the First World War.

In the second quote, Lenin referred to the <u>victors</u> of the First World War, the imperialist great powers that proceeded to divide up the world among themselves then.

The passages quoted from Lenin upto this point show that:

a) Lenin differentiated between imperialist powers, and treated imperialist great powers in a different category from other imperialist powers;

b) Lenin understood imperialist great powers to mean imperialist powers that "possess the clout to strive for world hegemony". Approaching the question in an all-sided manner and comprehensively, he took into consideration the totality of given facts in evaluating these powers;

c) Lenin examined these great imperialist powers in a category of their own, and established the differences among them as well as their weak and strong points.

Such are the views of Leninism on imperialism as advanced by Lenin himself.

"Theoreticians of the Three Worlds" twisted this clear understanding of Leninism and created a category of so-called "superpowers", comprising the USA and the Soviet Union only, outside of the category of "imperialist great powers". Under the cover of "concrete analysis", "changing conditions", etc., they propagated the view that the world was no longer divided up among imperialist great powers, but only between the "two superpowers"; that only these two were in a situation to contend for world hegemony; and, furthermore, they presented imperialist great powers other than the so-called "two superpowers" as "friends" and "allies" to the world proletariat and peoples. The understanding of "two superpowers", i.e., the understanding which depicts only the United States and Soviet Union as powers "striving for world hegemony", the understanding which ceases to represent other imperialist great powers that are capable of contending, and, in fact, do contend, for world hegemony as targets of the revolution, is one of the fundamental points of departure and an inseparable component of the "Three Worlds Theory".

Anyone who says that today only the United States and the Soviet Union are capable of contending for world hegemony is oblivious of the present world realities. To say so means, for instance, that one cannot see how far advanced is West German imperialism in terms of economic expansion around the globe from the Soviet Union. It means failure to see, for instance, how far advanced is Japanese imperialism in electronics industry from other imperialist great powers. It means failure to see, for instance, that British imperialism retains one of the largest colonial and semi-colonial empires in the whole world today. It means failure to see, for instance, that French imperialism is still one of the biggest usurers and has some of the largest semi-colonial possessions in the world.

The fact that the United States and the Soviet Union head up the military pacts of NATO and WARSAW respectively cannot be a justification for treating them in a different category from other imperialist great powers. The fact that these two imperialist great powers head up these military pacts cannot in any way mean that only these powers are warlike and aggressive, whipping up war hysteria; that others do not incite war. Moreover, there is no guarantee that the existing military pacts will remain as they are in the event of a real war some day. Every imperialist great power has the clout to start off an imperialist world war today: and in the event of such a war breaking out, every big imperi-

alist power will fight to establish its own domination over the globe, on its own if possible, but failing that, it will fight to acquire for itself the largest share of the loot. No imperialist great power will enter into a war on the side of another imperialist great power, a so-called "superpower", just for the sake of it. What distinguishes imperialist great powers from other imperialist powers presently is that the latter are not in a position to start off and maintain an imperialist world war on their own. Yet, in the event of an outbreak of imperialist world war, they also will strive to come out of the war with the greatest possible profit for themselves by taking part in various military pacts. Lackeys of imperialism in semi-colonial countries will partake in the war on the side of their overlords.

On the issue of war, the understanding of "two superpowers"

The understanding of "two superpowers", which is nothing but the "first world" of the "Three Worlds Theory", propagates such views that only the United States and the Soviet Union incite and can start off a war, thereby lulling to sleep the working class and toilers in great imperialist states like West Germany, France, Britain, Japan, etc.

Today, not only the so-called "two superpowers" but also other imperialist big powers are armed to the teeth. Presently the weakest among imperialist powers in terms of armaments, Japan is rapidly closing the gap. The nuclear reactors and the high level of technique possessed by Japanese imperialism allow this great power to make atomic weapons in the near future. Other big powers do already possess atomic weaponry. In terms of conventionel arms, both British and French as well as West German imperialism possess a colossal force.

At the First Conference of the TKP/ML in 1978, the understanding of "superpowers" was rejected, and it was declared that this understanding and the term superpower was a component part of the "Three Worlds Theory". (See the Joint Declaration of the MLPÖ and the TKP/ML, July 1978) (5)

Many Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary parties and groups which claimed to reject the "Three Worlds Theory" continued to uphold the understanding of "two superpowers" and the thesis that the two superpowers are the main enemy of the peoples of the world. Among them were parties like the RCP, USA and RCP Ch which today lay claim to "facilitating the unity of Marxist-Leninists". On these two points they were criticized by us as well as other Marxist-Leninist groups such as the MLPÖ, GDS and WBK.

Notwithstanding these criticisms, maybe in response to them, these two parties asserted the following in the "Outline for position paper" at the preparatory stage of the Conference:

> "In today's situation it is correct to speak of two superpowers, not only in the sense that these imperialist state (the US and the Soviet Union) are the two most powerful reactionary forces in the world today, but more than that they are under today's conditions (and without a redivision among the imperialists that could only come about in any

> case through world war) the only two states capable of heading up imperialist blocs to wage a world war,..." ("Outline", p.3) (Underlined by us)

As one can see, "only the two superpowers" are capable of waging a world war, according to the authors of the above lines. Imperialist powers like West Germany, France, Japan and Britain are not capable of waging an imperialist world war in today's conditions so long as a new world war started off by the two superpowers does not change the situation!!! This is tantamount to saying that the striving for world hegemony is waged only between the United States and the Soviet Union, that other imperialist powers are second-rate, etc. Speaking in Leninist terms, this means that the United States and the Soviet Union alone are imperialist great powers! Bourgeoisies of imperialist great powers like West Germany, Japan, Britain and France will express their heartfelt thanks to these self-styled Marxist-Leninists for such a Marxist-Leninist analysis! For in this light these bourgeoisies are represented as not contending for world hegemony, as unwarlike to the proletariat of their own countries by these would-be Marxist-Leninists. Proponents of this thesis may curse the "Three Worlds Theory" as much as they like, but they have not broken with this theory. They may curse the Party of Labor of Albania as much as they like, but on this score they share the same views with it. Apparently, the understanding of "two superpowers" as it was put forward in the "Outline for position paper" rather disturbed some of the participating groups at the Conference (6) so that the term "two superpowers" was dropped in the Communiqué signed at the end of the Conference.

On this score the following was written in the Communiqué:

> "In the current historical conjuncture it is only the two most powerful imperialist powers, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., who are capable of heading up imperialist blocs to go to world war. These two imperialist powers are also the most powerful bastions of reaction in the world today." ("Communiqué", p.2)

As you can see, the term "two superpowers" is not employed here, but the same understanding is still there, it has not changed. The correct statement that comes in succession, i.e., that "all the other imperialist powers are ... reactionary, aggressive and enemies of the proletariat and the peoples of the world", cannot remove the distortion of the Leninist understanding of "imperialist great powers"; the "two superpowers" are handled in a special category, and in this way all demarcation lines between imperialist great powers like West Germany, Japan. France and Britain on the one hand, and second-rate imperialist powers like Austria, Holland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Luxembourg, etc. are effaced.

In conclusion, the Communiqué, raising itself on two fundamentally false deviations of "Mao Zedong Thought" and "two superpowers", did not turn into an important step to "forge and unite around a correct ideological and political line for the international communist movement" ("Communiqué", p.3); instead, it turned into an important step for facilitating the unity of

the parties and groups upholding these deviations. And so was proved once more the necessity of ideological struggle against this current in the efforts that must be expended to bring about the unity of the World Marxist-Leninist Movement.

What need to be done today in order to facilitate the unity of the World Marxist-Leninist Movement, which steps should be taken? What are the tasks that fall on our shoulders?

Our reply to these questions consists in the following:

PRESENTLY, THE URGENT QUESTION IS NOT THAT OF FACILITATING THE ORGANIZATIONAL UNITY OF MARXIST-LENINISTS INTERNATIONALLY.

FOR ORGANIZATIONAL UNITY HAS A MEANING ONLY IF IT IS A RESULT OF IDEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL UNITY; ONLY THEN CAN IT BE A SOLID UNITY! A SEEMING ORGANIZATIONAL UNITY THAT IS OBTAINED AT THE EXPENSE OF IDEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL UNITY, AN ORGANIZATIONAL UNITY THAT IS BROUGHT ABOUT AT THE COST OF SICKENING AND UNPRINCIPLED COMPROMISES IN ORDER JUST TO SEEM STRONG, IS DOOMED TO COLLAPSE FROM THE START! RESULTS OF INSTANCES OF SUCH COMPROMISES CAN BE READILY SEEN IN THE NOT TOO DISTANT PAST OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT. THE ORGANIZATIONAL UNITY THAT WAS RAISED ON THE BASIS OF UNPRINCIPLED COMPROMISES MADE IN THE DECLARATIONS OF 1957 AND 1960 BEGAN TO CRUMBLE AS SOON AS IT WAS ERECTED, AND ONLY SERVED THE INTERESTS OF MODERN REVISIONISTS. THE KIND OF UNITY THAT THE WORLD MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT NEEDS TODAY IS NOT THIS KIND OF UNITY.

THE KIND OF UNITY THAT WE NEED TODAY IS A UNITY BASED ON THE PRINCIPLES OF MARXISM-LENINISM, ON THE REJECTION OF EVERY REVISIONIST AND OPPORTUNIST DEVIATION AND THE REJECTION OF COMPROMISING WITH THEM; A UNITY RAISED ON THE BASIS OF A PLATFORM THAT IS COLLECTIVELY WORKED OUT BY THE MARXIST-LENINIST FORCES IN A PROCESS OF OPEN DEBATE AND CRITICISM CONDUCTED BEFORE THE PUBLIC IN A SPIRIT OF MUTUAL SOLIDARITY.

TODAY A MARXIST-LENINIST PLATFORM ON WHICH THE WORLD MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT CAN UNITE DOES NOT READILY EXIST!

OUR GUIDING PRINCIPLES IN ELABORATING SUCH A PROGRAM MUST BE THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF MARXISM-LENINISM. "THE PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL" ELABORATED AFTER A PROCESS OF COLLECTIVE EFFORTS AND ADOPTED IN 1928 CAN BE TAKEN AS AN EXAMPLE IN OUR EFFORTS TO FORGE A PLATFORM. WHILE TRYING TO WORK OUT THIS NEW PLATFORM, HOWEVER, ACCOUNT MUST BE TAKEN OF THE EXPERIENCES OF THE PROLETARIAN CLASS STRUGGLE IN THE PERIOD BETWEEN THE PREPARATION OF THE COMINTERN PROGRAM AND NOW. IN PREPARING SUCH A PROGRAM, THE EXPERIENCE OF THE STRUGGLE OF COMMUNISTS LED BY STALIN AGAINST THE MODERN REVISIONISTS PARTICULARLY IN THE AFTERMATH OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR MUST BE SUMMED UP RIGHTLY AND BUILT ON. THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE KHRUSHCHEV-STYLE MODERN REVISIONISM WAGED BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA UNDER MAO AND THE PARTY OF LABOR OF ALBANIA UNDER ENVER HOXHA AND OTHER MARXIST-LENINISTS MUST BE SUMMED UP CORRECTLY AND THE ERRORS AND SHORTCOMINGS OF THIS STRUGGLE REMOVED. SIMILARLY, CORRECT LESSONS MUST BE DRAWN FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE ANTI-MARXIST-LENINIST TREND THAT GOES BY THE NAME OF "MAO ZEDONG THOUGHT", AND THE COUNTER-

GOES BY THE NAME OF "MAO ZEDONG THOUGHT" AND THE COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY "THREE WORLDS THEORY". REVISIONIST DEVIATIONS AMONG THE FORCES OPPOSING THE "THREE WORLDS THEORY", ABOVE ALL, THE PRESENT LINE OF THE PARTY OF LABOR OF ALBANIA MUST BE COMBATED.

COMMUNIST-MARXIST-LENINIST REVOLUTIYNARIES ALL OVER THE GLOBE OUGHT TO CONTRIBUTE TOWARD THE SOLUTION OF THESE TASKS IN PROPORTION TO THEIR STRENGTH. IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO CREATE THE PLATFORM ON WHICH THE WORLD MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT CAN RAISE ITSELF, REVISIONISM IN QUESTIONS OF METHODOLOGY, I.E., THE METHOD OF COVERING UP IDEOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES, MUST BE ABANDONED, AN OPEN AND PRINCIPLED STRUGGLE MUST BE CONDUCTED OVER THE IDEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS BEFORE THE PUBLIC. GROUPS THAT REALLY DO HAVE IDEOLOGICAL UNITY WITH ONE ANOTHER SHOULD COME TOGETHER AND UNITE THEIR FORCES IN THE WORK OF ELABORATING A PLATFORM. EACH AND EVERY GROUP OUGHT TO SUBMIT ITS VIEWS TO THE SCRUTINY OF THE ENTIRE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT FOR DISCUSSION. BEFORE UNITING, AND IN ORDER THAT WE MAY UNITE, DIFFERENCES MUST BE GONE INTO IN A PRINCIPLED MANNER AND LINES OF DEMARCATION CLARIFIED.

ONLY AFTER PASSING THROUGH THIS STAGE, ONLY AFTER THE LINES OF DEMARCATION ARE CLARIFIED TO THE FULLEST EXTENT, AFTER THE OPEN IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE CONDUCTED OVER THE DRAFT PLATFORM (OR PLATFORMS), OVER THE VARIOUS ISSUES OF THE PLATFORM HAS REACHED A CERTAIN MATURITY CAN THE VARIOUS VANGUARD DETACHMENTS OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT COLLECTIVELY GIVE THE PLATFORM ITS DEFINITIVE SHAPE IN A CONFERENCE THAT IS ALSO PREPARED JOINTLY, AND TAKE THE FIRST STEP OF ORGANIZATIONAL UNITY.

IN ORDER TO MAKE ANY HEADWAY IN THIS DIRECTION, THE GREATEST CONTRIBUTION OF EVERY ORGANIZATION WOULD BE TO CLARIFY ITS OWN VIEWS IN RELATION TO THE PROGRAM. EVERY ORGANIZATION, GRASPING THAT IT IS A PART OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT, OUGHT TO GRASP THE QUESTIONS OF THE PLATFORM OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AS ITS VERY OWN PROBLEMS, OUGHT TO ACT WITH THIS CONSCIOUSNESS, AND SHOULD NOT CONSIDER THE WORK AND DISCUSSION ON THIS SUBJECT A LUXURY.

SPECIFICALLY, THE TASK THAT FALLS ON OUR SHOULDERS IS TO CLARIFY OUR OWN VIEWS ON THE THEMES BEING DEBATED INSIDE THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT; TO SUBMIT OUR VIEWS TO THE SCRUTINY AND DISCUSSION OF OUR WORLD MOVEMENT; TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS WITH PARTIES AND GROUPS WITH WHICH WE HAVE IDEOLOGICAL UNITY, AND TO COMBAT FALSE VIEWS IN PROPORTION TO OUR STRENGTH.

UNITY OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT WILL BE FACILITATED ONLY AS A RESULT OF LONG, PATIENT AND CONSISTENT WORK!

LET US COURAGEOUSLY TAKE UP THE TASKS FALLING ON OUR SHOULDERS!

Below we are reproducing the text of an Appeal by the Central Leadership of the Communist Party of Turkey/Marxist-Leninist(Bolshevik) (TKP/ML(B)):

---

## APPEAL ON ALL REVOLUTIONARIES

## SUPPORT THE REVOLUTIONARIES IN THE DUNGEONS OF FASCISM!

Workers, Toilers ...
Our country is experiencing one of the darkest periods of fascism in her entire history. In the offensives launched against the people by imperialism's lackey Junta, over one hundred thousand revolutionaries, democrats and patriots were dumped into the prisons of fascism. Torture chambers operated incessantly and keep on doing so.

Now, before "independent" courts, as it were, tens of thousands of revolutionaries belonging to miscellaneous revolutionary organizations will be tried by the ruling classes. Mass trials have started and will continue.

Worker and Toiler Friend ...
Living under the constant threat of being taken into torture, being forced to live in inhuman conditions, these tens of thousands of revolutionaries became the target of attack for the ruling classes because they were fighting for a lofty cause. They fought against imperialist exploitation and oppression, for an independent Turkey. They fought against the fascist dictatorship of the flunkeys of imperialism, for a People's Democratic Turkey. They fought for a world completely freed from exploitation. They are waging a righteous struggle today in most adverse conditions. Today, they are endeavoring to carry on the fight for this lofty cause in the dungeons and torture chambers of fascism. The cause for which they are fighting is, in fact, the cause of all workers and toilers.

It is an imperative duty on the part of all revolutionary workers and toilers to back up our imprisoned revolutionary comrades,who are continuing this glorious fight in the torture chambers, dungeons and the courts; to show them that they are not alone.

We appeal to all revolutionaries to discharge this duty, to concretely support these revolutionaries, using all possible means at their disposal.

With this leaflet, we are starting a campaign to support the revolutionaries in the dungeons of fascism materially. We shall endeavor to send the donations collected during this campaign to our needy revolutionary comrades through suitable channels, irrespective of their political orientation.

We urge all revolutionary organizations to participate in this campaign or organize parallel campaigns of their own. In this concrete instance, we entreat all revolutionary organizations to unite in action, to combine their resources to reach revolutionary prisoners.

Workers, Toilers ...
Start collecting donations of money, clothes, shoes and medicine for the revolutionaries in custody or imprisoned. Get in contact with the Bolsheviks or other revolutionary organizations around you that are conducting work toward the same end in order to send the donations to imprisoned revolutionaries.

Revolutionary workers and toilers supporting the Bolsheviks ...
We urge you to join this campaign, to carry on and spread it.
At the start of this campaign we urge all Bolshevik supporters to set aside their New Year bonuses for our revolutionary brothers and sisters in prison.

SOLIDARITY IS OUR WEAPON.

TKP/ML(Bolshevik)
Central Leadership

November 1, 1981

# N O T E S :

1-Here, of course, we do not wish to say that the First Central Committee of the TKP/ML held clear and correct views on the unity of the International Marxist-Leninist Movement from the start to the finish. When the totality of the First Central Committee's documents is studied, it is readily seen that the First Central Committee followed a "zig-zag" course on this issue, the cause of which was the non-homogeneous composition of the Central Committee and the Party. Nevertheless, as one can see from the extensive passage quoted from the Report of the Seventh Meeting of the First Central Committee, the course of development of the First Central Committee, at least upto and including its Seventh Meeting, was in a positive direction, in the direction of recognizing the profundity of the questions in the course of time and trying to overcome them. From the Eighth Meeting of the Central Committee onward, the direction of development became negative. Wherever the Party line, containing as it did many eclectic points, came into conflict, contradicted, with Marxism-Leninism, the defense of anti-Marxist-Leninist views in the name of upholding the Party line began to be preferred, to be turned into principles. This negative development was endorsed at the II. Conference and still continues.

2-Our "theory haters" are those who claim that all theoretical questions have already been solved, that the "Five Basic Documents" of Ibrahim Kaypakkaya embody Marxism-Leninism in its totality.

3-The Joint Communiqué says: "... they ('the new revisionist rulers in China') have fraudulently tried to pass off /their reactionary "strategic theory of the three worlds"/ to the ignorant as the work of Mao himself" (p.10) and thereby absolves Mao Tsetung of any responsibility whatsoever on the "Three Worlds Theory". This is tantamount to closing one's eyes to some unpalatable facts, to slurring over the questions.

The opinion of the parties taking part at the Conference, and especially that of the RCP, USA is that all was well in China until Mao's death. This is an understanding that does not score with facts, an anti-Marxist-Leninist approach which fails to see the depth of the questions involved, or knowingly obscures them.

4-Were one to approach the issue as the RCP, USA and the RCP Ch. do, then Germany and England ought to have been declared "two superpowers" back in 1916.

5-This rejection was brought about as a result of the pressure brought to bear by the Marxist-Leninists who are in the Bolshevik ranks today. Now the new Central Committee-elected by the II. Conference is trying to spread the understanding behind the concept two superpowers without employing the term Super superpowers". The latest example of this is a pamphlet that appeared as a Partisan publication, titled "The Political situation in tthe world and in Turkey". The pamphlet pays lip-service to the truth that "the imperialist system is the source of war as a whole", but wherever the pamphlet takes up the areas of "hotting up war factors" individually, there the contention is depicted as existing only "between the United States and the Soviet Union".

The pamphlet goes so far in this respect that even in Turkey the main contending parties are depicted as "lackeys of U.S. imperialism and the Russian social-imperialism". No one ought to be taken in by surprise when the Second Central Committee employs the term "two superpowers" in the course of time.

6-Representatives of the TKP/ML attending the Conference upheld the line of the I. Conference of the Party and criticised the understanding of "two superpowers".